

1 On March 6, 2009, Appellant filed exceptions to the director's determination. In her exceptions,
2 Appellant asked that her position be reallocated to the Administrative Assistant 4 (AA4) classification.
3 Appellant's exceptions are the subject of this proceeding.
4

5 Appellant works in the Audit Administration unit of the Operations Division. Appellant reports to
6 the Assistant Director for Audit Administration. In addition, the Assistant Director has an
7 Administrative Assistant 5 who reports directly to him. Audit Administration has roughly 280
8 employees including employees located in 15 field offices and outside of Washington State.
9 Appellant provides administrative support for her supervisor and four Washington Management
10 Service managers. Within Audit Administration, Appellant's program responsibilities include travel
11 for all employees and coordinating the employee recognition programs.
12

13 **Summary of Appellant's Arguments.** Appellant argues that she has division-wide responsibilities
14 which include approving an average of \$19,000 in expenditures a month and the purchase and lease of
15 office equipment for the administration office and the field offices. Appellant contends that Audit
16 Administration is the largest division in Revenue and that it is larger than many state agencies.
17 Therefore, Appellant argues that her position fits the AA4 class because she is an assistant to the head of
18 a major sub-division. Appellant asserts that in another division of Revenue, there are three AA5
19 positions directly reporting to the deputy director and that there is no reason why the Assistant Director
20 of her division cannot have an AA4 and an AA5 reporting directly to him. Appellant argues that the
21 scope of her work and the precedent set by Revenue through the allocation of other administrative
22 positions support the reallocation of her position to the AA4 classification.
23

24 **Summary of Respondent's Arguments.** Respondent argues that Appellant's supervisor has an AA5
25 serving as his principal assistant and therefore, Appellant does not serve as the principal assistant to her
26 supervisor. Respondent recognizes that some elements of Appellant's job fit within the AA4
27 classification but argues that she is not responsible for institution-wide matters. Rather, Respondent
28 contends her responsibilities reside exclusively within Audit Administration. Respondent agrees that
29

Appellant has division-wide responsibilities within Audit Administration but argues that she is not the sole administrative support for the division. Respondent asserts that there are at least 25 managers in the division who share in the administrative responsibilities for their individual work units. Respondent asserts that Appellant's responsibility for approving purchases and expenditures and coordinating conferences and smaller projects fits within the AA3 classification. Respondent argues that the record before the Board supports a finding that the AA3 is the best fit for Appellant's position.

Primary Issue. Whether the director's determination that Appellant's position is properly allocated to the Administrative Assistant 3 classification should be affirmed.

Relevant Classifications. Administrative Assistant 3, class code 105G; Administrative Assistant 4, class code 105H.

Decision of the Board. The purpose of a position review is to determine which classification best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of a position. A position review is neither a measurement of the volume of work performed, nor an evaluation of the expertise with which that work is performed. A position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a particular position to the available classification specifications. This review results in a determination of the class that best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position. See Liddle-Stamper v. Washington State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

In Byrnes v. Dept's of Personnel and Corrections, PRB No. R-ALLO-06-005 (2006), we held that "[w]hile a comparison of one position to another similar position may be useful in gaining a better understanding of the duties performed by and the level of responsibility assigned to an incumbent, allocation of a position must be based on the overall duties and responsibilities assigned to an individual position compared to the existing classifications. The allocation or misallocation of a similar position is not a determining factor in the appropriate allocation of a position." Citing to Flahaut v. Dept's of Personnel and Labor and Industries, PAB No. ALLO 96-0009 (1996).

1 Following the reasoning cited above, the reporting relationships and allocations or misallocations
2 of AA5 positions reporting to a deputy director in another division are not a determining factor in
3 the appropriate allocation of Appellant's position.

4 Most positions within the civil service system occasionally perform duties that appear in more than
5 one classification. However, when determining the appropriate classification for a specific position,
6 the duties and responsibilities of that position must be considered in their entirety and the position
7 must be allocated to the classification that provides the best fit overall for the majority of the
8 position's duties and responsibilities. Dudley v. Dept. of Labor and Industries, PRB Case No. R-
9 ALLO-07-007 (2007).

10
11 The definition for the AA4 classification provides:

12 Positions serve as the assistant on administrative matters to the head of a state
13 agency, the head of a major sub-division or major operating location of an agency,
14 or to the chief administrator or head of a major organizational unit such as a school,
college, or major academic/administrative department.

15 (Emphasis added)

16
17 The distinguishing characteristics of the AA4 classification state, in relevant part:

18 Positions perform higher-level administrative duties of a substantive nature that are
19 appropriate to be performed by the supervisor, manager, administrator, or
20 professional level employee but have been delegated to the administrative assistant
to perform. . . For general government positions, secretarial or clerical duties are
incidental to the administrative functions performed.

21
22 For those positions in a major organizational unit such as a school, college, or
23 major academic/administrative department, the "unit" will typically have more than
24 75 full-time equivalent professional and/or classified staff; OR service responsibility
25 for more than 4,000 full-time students or staff, . . . OR positions serve as both sole
26 administrative support and the executive secretary reporting to the organizational
head. These positions are assigned to major units, with institution-wide
responsibility, that have no assistant directors, deans or managers who would share
the administrative duties of the position.

1 Audit Administration is one of the organizational units that report to the Senior Assistant
2 Director of Operations. Operations is a division of the Department of Revenue and Audit
3 Administration is a sub-division of Operations. Appellant provides assistance on some
4 administrative tasks matters for the Assistant Director for Audit Administration. However,
5 because an AA5 is the principal assistant to the Assistant Director, Appellant is not the assistant
6 for administrative matters. Additionally, managers in Audit Administration share in the
7 administrative responsibilities for their individual work units. Appellant does not perform the scope of
8 duties encompassed at the AA4 level. Appellant's position does not meet the definition or
9 distinguishing characteristics of the AA4 classification.

10
11 The definition of the AA3 classification provides:

12 Positions perform varied administrative and secretarial support duties or positions
13 are responsible for one or more major program activities under a second line
14 supervisor.

15 The distinguishing characteristics of the AA3 classification state:

16 Positions are delegated higher-level administrative support duties or positions are
17 delegated one or more major program activities that would be performed under a
18 second-level professional supervisor, manager or administrator in WMS Band II or
19 above or in exempt service, chief administrator, or head of a major organizational
20 unit such as a school, college, or major academic or administrative department.
Only one position will be allocated to an individual second-line supervisor for those
positions performing one or more major program activities.

21 A major program activity is defined as a function that is a major element of the
22 supervisor's job. The duty must stand alone and would create significant adverse
23 consequences if poorly performed. However, full delegation can't occur if the
24 supervisor's position requires specialized licensure such as attorneys, medical
doctors, and engineers.

25 Higher-level administrative duties are duties of a substantive nature that are
26 appropriate to be performed by the supervisor, manager, administrator, or
27 professional level employee but have been delegated to the administrative assistant
28 to perform. Areas may include but are not limited to, the following: budget
29 development and/or management, expenditure control, office space management,
equipment purchases, budget development and/or management, public relations,
personnel administration, records management, and report preparation.

1 Incumbents in these positions represent the supervisor's and/or unit's goals and
2 interests and provide interpretation or explanation of the supervisor's policies or
3 viewpoints.

4 Appellant's position performs a variety of high-level administrative support duties. Her duties are
5 of a substantive nature and include coordinating programs and events within the sub-division and
6 make travel arrangements for sub-division staff. Appellant approves travel requests and maintains
7 travel records; coordinates quarterly meetings and staff conferences, including negotiating
8 accommodation contracts; and exercises expenditure authority to the purchase office equipment
9 and furniture for the sub-division. Appellant's position fits within the definition and distinguishing
10 characteristics of the AA3 classification.

11
12 In a hearing on exceptions, the Appellant has the burden of proof. WAC 357-52-110. Appellant has
13 failed to meet her burden of proof. The Administrative Assistant 3 classification best describes the
14 overall duties and responsibilities of Appellant's position.

15
16 **ORDER**

17 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by Christine
18 Younger is denied and the director's determination dated February 5, 2009, is affirmed.

19 DATED this ____ day of _____, 2009.

20 WASHINGTON PERSONNEL RESOURCES BOARD

21
22
23 _____
JOSEPH PINZONE, Chair

24
25 _____
26 DJ MARK, Member